

## Venetians and Ottomans in the Early Modern Age

Essays on Economic and Social Connected History

edited by Anna Valerio

# The Earliest Records of Income and Expenses of the Sultan

Snezhana Rakova

(South-West University “Neofit Rilski”, Bulgaria)

**Abstract** This paper presents in a chronological order some Venetian sources (primarily, but not only) containing data about the Ottoman state, governance, income and army. This information is analyzed and presented in the form of tables, which give us different types of revenues and expenses. It is unique for the 15th century and can be compared partially only with the contemporary ottoman written documentation. Presented here is the data from the works of Laonikos Chalkokondyles, and manuscripts of Iacopo Promontorio de Campis, a Venetian anonymous author from 1490, the Venetian *Relazione* by Alvise Sagondino from 1496 and other diplomatic reports from the first decades of the 16th century. The report of Felix Petantius from 1502 to the Hungarian king has been added to other Venetian texts, because it was edited in a different manuscript version and presented to Venice.

**Keywords** Laonikos Chalkokondyles. Iacopo Promontorio de Campis. Anonymous author from 1490. Venetian diplomats. Felix Petantius. Income and expenses of the Ottoman Empire.

The contribution of Venice to the knowledge of the budget of the Ottoman state is very precious, particularly for the early periods of the Ottoman history. Chronologically, this study will cover the time of the first mentions of the Sultan’s revenue in Venetian (and also in Western) sources from the middle of the 15th century to the time of the appearance of the first Ottoman sources (c. 1530).



Firstly, we have to pay tribute to the work of the great Ottomanists of the 20th century. It is to them that we owe everything we know until now about the finances of the Ottoman Empire from the 15th century. Among the most distinguished are the names of Franz Babinger, to whom we are indebted for the publishing and comments of the manuscript of Iacopo Promontorio de Campis (Babinger 1956), and to the great researcher of the Venetian Archive Nicolae Iorga for discovering many of the Venetian texts. But as far as the study of Ottoman history is concerned, first we have to note the remarkable contributions of Ömer Lütfi Barkan and Halil İnalcik to the study of the problems of economic history, and especially for illuminating the financial organization of the early Ottoman Empire. Perhaps, it is possible now to add some more details to the analysis of

---

**Hilâl 6** e-ISSN 2610-8895 | ISSN 2610-9484

DOI 10.30687/978-88-6969-260-4/002 | Submitted: 2018-01-19 | Accepted: 2018-03-10

ISBN [ebook] 978-88-6969-260-4 | ISBN [print] 978-88-6969-261-1

© 2018 |   Creative Commons 4.0 Attribution alone

already well-known sources, or even to discover some new evidence and new manuscripts that have remained unknown until now.

It is not the place here to discuss the research on the Ottoman financial documentation itself, although this has been the problem of investigation of numerous scholars until recently. The research publications of Linda Darling (1996, 1997, 2008) can be mentioned as an example. On the basis of this and other studies, the important conclusions about the state of the Sultan's income are as follows: the Ottoman revenue surveys appear in the first half of the 14th century, but they only apply to some regions, usually newly conquered ones, as for example the register of the *Arvanid sandjak* from 1431, or individual cities as Thessaloniki, Istanbul etc. in the 15th century; there is no preserved general survey of the entire Empire that dates back to the 15th century (Darling 1997; Barkan [1970] 1978; Boykov 2016).

It is important therefore to turn to other sources. In his studies, Halil İnalçık has shown the importance of Western, primarily Venetian information about the income of the Empire. We could start from a general view of the Sultan's revenue, which İnalçık included in his *Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire*. Until 1527 (i.e. the time of appearance of first general Ottoman surveys), we have ten reports concerning the Sultan's profit, written mostly by Western authors. The first notice on the revenue belongs to Bertrandon de la Broquière, a Bourgoundian diplomat who visited Adrianople in 1433 and reported about 2,500,000 ducats (as quoted in Babinger 1978, 26). About thirty years later the famous historian Laonicos Chalkokondyles gives us a detailed description of the revenue sources for the treasury of the Sultan, which will be discussed below. Then, Alvise Sagondino (1496), Andrea Gritti (1503), Teodoro Spandugino Cantacuscino (c. 1510), Tommaso Mocenigo (c. 1520), Marco Minio (1522), Pietro Zenò (1524) and Pietro Bragadin (1527) follow.

The well-known Genoese merchant Jacopo Promontorio de Campis can be added to the authors, included in İnalçık's list. He writes about the Ottoman state in its treaty dated 1475 and should therefore be placed among the first Western informers (see Babinger 1956). Seven of the ten authors, pointed out by İnalçık, are Venetians. If we exclude the earliest author, the above mentioned Bertrandon de la Broquiere, who shows us that the Turkish governors themselves gladly shared internal information on the revenues of the Sultan, it should be noted that the information on the Sultan's budget is present in the diplomatic reports, kept in the Venetian archive and Marciana library. The first of these diplomatic reports appeared at the very end of the 15th century. We might contemplate a bit more on the connections of two of the other informers with Venice. The famous historian Laonicos Chalkokondyles (c. 1430-1470) follows suit and we know that his cousin or brother, according to some scholars, Demetrios Chalkokondyles was a professor of Greek at the *Studio di Padova* (the university of Venice) and that Laonicos himself has had close contacts with

Italian men of letters such as Ciriaco d'Ancona. The next one is Theodore Spandounes or Spandugino, who lived for some time in Venice, and then was forced to leave for France where he died probably in 1538.

Returning to Laonicos Chalkokondyles, at first it must be noted that although he has been known to the historians for a long time, only recently we have become more aware of the quantity of information he possessed and his worldly connection with the Ottoman grandees, as well as with the Italian humanists. Now we can refer to the new edition of the Chalkokondyles's *Histories*, produced by Anthony Kaldellis three years ago with some interesting accompanying studies (Kaldellis 2012, 2014; Preisler-Kapeller 2013). Nevertheless, we owe Franz Babinger and Nicolae Iorga the illumination of the circle of Byzantine intellectuals formed around the new Sultan - Mehmed the Conqueror in Constantinople (Babinger 1978, 246-7; Iorga [1935] 1982, 55). While explaining from whom he learned about the Sultan's accounts, Chalkokondyles himself pointed out one of the padishah's secretaries, the one who was responsible for the calculations (Kaldellis 2014, 264). We are talking about one of the sons of Georgios Amiroutzes (1400-1470), a Greek nobleman from Trebizond, who became the Sultan's calligrapher.

Here are the items of the budget, pointed out in book 8 from *The Histories*: the *kharaj* (poll tax) from Europe (i.e. Rumelia), the taxes on cattle, trade, mines, rice and salt, and finally the tributes from foreign rulers, which are about 100,000 ducats (see Appendix 1). Thus, the income of the Sultan, according to Laonicos, including both what accrues to him through the Porte and to the so-called *hazine* (treasury) of the sultan, is about 4,000,000 gold pieces. Together with the revenues from the *timars* (land revenues), it reaches the incredible number of 9,000,000. As Chalkokondyles points out, the expenses of the Sultan are mainly for the salaries of the army. Speros Vryonis (1976), in his well-grounded article on this issue, published 40 years ago, calculates only the stated revenues which reach 2,300,000. It has to be noted that we have the revenue from the *kharaj* from Rumelia, 900,000 ducats, and the numbers of other revenues are pointed out for Rumelia and Anatolia together (Vryonis 1976, 425-6). Vryonis compares further the data from Chalkokondyles with the numbers reported later by Iacopo Promontorio de Campis, and also with the numbers about the amount of the *kharaj* from the Ottoman survey from 1488-89 which is stated as being 29,929,538 akces (i.e. 610,806 ducats. Exchange rate 49 akce to 1 ducat) (Vryonis 1976, 428-30).

The information from the Genoese Jacopo Promontorio de Campis from 1475 is well known from the first edition and commentary of his manuscript, written by Franz Babinger (1956) (see Appendix 2). To this famous author we owe quite detailed information about the Sultan's income and expenditure, although its accuracy can be questioned. The Genoese merchant obviously has direct information, and for the first time we have the

complete budget per items from Rumelia and Anatolia, including revenues from Constantinople, Gallipoli, Thessaloniki, Enos, etc., as well as taxes on salt production and mines. The total number of revenues is 1,831,000 ducats, and the reported expenses about the Sultan's stables, payment, *cucina* (nutrition for the court), harem, gifts and dowries, and for the fleet amounted to 1,375,000. Even if Jacopo Promontorio de Campis' manuscript is preserved in Bologna, we can hardly assume that his report ever reached Venice. It was not probably known in Venice, but 15 years later a detailed register of the Sultan's revenues and expenses was drawn up there. A two-page manuscript by an anonymous author is kept in a codex from Marino Sanudo's possessions, which is preserved in the Marciana Library. The manuscript was studied for the first time 110 years ago by Nicolae Iorga and excerpts from it are included in the second volume of his *History of the Ottoman Empire*, published in 1909, but incomplete and with many errors and missing parts (Iorga [1909] 2015, 215-18). Here we provide a full text with a new reading, both in terms of the text and the numbers of ducats derived from different sources of income (see Appendix 3 according to the original version in Italian).

The title of the text is: *Intrade del Signor Turcho de la Grexia, 1490* (Revenues of the sultan from Greece, 1490; see Appendix 3). According to the anonymous author, the revenues from Rumelia in 1490 are about two million from kharaj, *commerchio* (the tax on trade) including taxes from the different cities (Sofia, Thessaloniki, Philippopolis, Adrianople and Constantinople), revenues from salt, alum, inherited goods and naturally from tributes from Bosnia, Wallachia, Trebizond, Ragusa, islands etc.: in total 1,125,000 ducats (number, which differs from the author's accounting!). The revenue from Anatolia is much less, and it is derived mainly from Bursa, from the production of alum and from the copper from Kastamoni. According to our reading, it amounts to approximately 180,000. As far as the expenditures given by this author are concerned, the cost is mostly for the army: 350,000 ducats, for the palace and its janissaries, slaves, stables, and also great expenses are noted for clothing.

There are doubts about the authorship of the document containing this information. It could be ascribed to Giovanni Maria Angioiello (Vicenza 1451-c. 1525) citizen of Venice, who returned to Italy exactly in that year after many travels in the Ottoman Empire, and who had previously been the *defterdar* (treasurer) of the Sultan. According to his biography, written by Babinger, he was in Vicenza until his death (Babinger 1961; Danova 2010).

The next series of records, mentioned already at the beginning, belongs to the Venetian diplomats. Some of them knew Turkish, as is the case with the first among them: Alvise Sagondino (1496). Upon his return from the mission, Sagondino gives to the Venetian authorities quite a detailed report about the revenues of the Sultan (Bayezid II), his army and his expenses (the text of the *relazione* is in Sanuto 1879, 397-400). The

reported revenue of Bayezid is 2,400,000 ducats per year, distributed in the following way:

From kharaj	900,000
From a third of the kharaj	300,000
From all his ports [ <i>scalosie</i> ]	500,000
From tax on the livestock, oxen [ <i>castroni</i> ]	400,000
From certain donations	300,000

The Sultan spent all this revenue and had so far withdrawn 3,000,000 from his father's deposit, which had been 6,000,000, according to the hearsay.

The Venetian envoys after Sagondino were also obliged to mention the revenues to the Sultan's treasury and the army expenses, the number of the different kinds of soldiers and the number of ships. As İnalçık stated, the reports of Venetian ambassadors provided information about the Sultan's income through the years: Andrea Gritti (1503) reported 5,000,000 ducats, Tommaso Mocenigo (c. 1520) 3,130,000, Marco Minio (1522) 3,000,000, Pietro Zeno (1524) 4,500,000, Pietro Bragadin (1527) 4,500,000 only for central treasury.

We shall not deal with this in detail, but it would be necessary to point out that we owe Maria Pia Pedani the discovery and publishing of some *relazioni* (ambassadors' reports), which have been unknown so far (Pedani-Fabris 1996). The ones of Tommaso Contarini from 1522 and Tommaso Mocenigo from 1530 are especially important, because they directly report the Sultan's budget. They provide detailed and very precise information on the specific types of revenue from Rumelia and Anatolia (Contarini 1996, 39; Mocenigo 1996, 43-4) (cf. Appendix 5). Extremely valuable in this case is the fact that their information can be compared to the first Ottoman general surveys. The report of Tommaso Contarini from 1522, for example, points out the total of 6,202,500 ducats of revenues. In his turn Tommaso Mocenigo reported a revenue of 6,240,000 ducats, gathered from salt mines, mines and livestock pastures in *Gretia* (i.e. Rumelia) and from trade taxes, possessions, property fees, fishponds – a total of half a million ducats from Europe; from the same sources in Anatolia the amount of revenue is half as low (750,000 ducats); only from the kharaj the income amounts to 2,300,000 and the expenses, primarily for the army, are about five million (Mocenigo 1996, 43-4).

On the other hand, as İnalçık points out, in 1528 the state revenue is 9,650,000 in Venetian ducats (İnalçık 1973, 116 without source quotation).

Finally, we would like to conclude with a text from 1502 which brings to our knowledge the sultan's revenues. It was not written by a Venetian, but by a Hungarian diplomat. Nevertheless its appearance is related to Venice. The manuscript has not been published yet, as far as we know. This is an

autograph of Felix Petantius (known as Felix Raguzinus and Felix Petančić, 1455-1522) written in Latin. In 1501-1502 Petančić was carrying out an important mission as an envoy of the Hungarian king. He passed through the Turkish lands, visited Rhodes and Venice in his travel back, and in the end presented to his king two valuable manuscripts. One of them has been known to the historians for a long time – it was studied and published by Agostino Pertusi – *Quibus itineribus Turci sint aggrediendi* (The Roads on which it is possible to go towards the Turks), but the second one is almost unknown. Petančić can be trusted, because he was among the few diplomats of his time who knew Turkish and probably had access to the right information (Pertusi 1970, 490; Rakova 2014).

The manuscript presented here is named *Genealogy of the Turkish Sultans*, and it is preserved in Budapest <sup>1</sup>(see Appendix 4). As it was conceived, it aimed to present the succession order of the Ottoman sultans, the principal governors even with their images, the structure of the Ottoman government and the composition of the army, and also arrange the collected data in clear order. It is also obvious that this manuscript was meant to be looked through, not published. We will mention here only the part with the statistics.

The revenues are given separately for Rumelia and Anatolia: 1,500,000 and 2,000,000 ducats respectively. The author also gives the number of the households in the two parts of the Empire: 80,000 Christian and 50,000 Turkish for Rumelia, and, a total of 1,600,000 Christian and Turkish for Anatolia (this numbers can be contested, cf. Boykov 2016). The sultan's treasury revenue is said to come from taxes, inheritance, taxation on cattle, trade with salt, copper and other metals, taxation on agricultural produce, custom taxes, etc. The expenditures of the Empire are chiefly for payment of daily rations and money for the army, but the author does not indicate the sums. In fact, we are able to identify the possible source of the part of the information that relates to the revenue of the Ottoman Empire: *La Relazione* by Alvise Sagondino.

The Venetian connection is expressed in the presence of a special manuscript by Petančić, left in the Venetian archive, now in Correr Library.<sup>2</sup> It also has not been published yet, but it presents a version of the previous one already commented here, although it does not give specific numbers for the revenues, but only lists them by items. The total sum given is 4,000,000. Its title and incipit are *Felicis Petantii Ragusei. Commentarium de Rebus Turcharu[m] ad Wladislaum Regem / Felix Petantius Raguseus ad Ser[enissimu]m Wladislau[m] hungarie et Boemie Regem.*

---

1 Budapest, National Library, cod. lat. 378. URL <http://www.corvina.oszk.hu/corvina-shtml/hub1codlat378.htm> (2018-02-22).

2 Venezia, Biblioteca del Museo Correr, Correr 894, 7 folios' *recto/verso*).

There are some opportunities for further research that could arise from what has been mentioned so far. The individual items of the sultan's revenues, reported by the various authors could be compared. They can be systematized according to the three extant in all the authors sections: Rumelia's revenue, Anatolia's income, and the revenues from vassal tributary states. It can also be summed up both on the increase in revenue by individual items and on the general trend of revenue growth for the sultan's treasury. The Venetian reports could be juxtaposed and verified with the help of the present Ottoman sources – for the period until 1502, as well as for the next one, after the full registers of the revenues of the Ottoman Empire got revealed.

Three of the sources presented and commented here for the first time are preserved as manuscripts in the Marciana Library, Library of Correr Museum, and in Budapest. Without any doubt they contain valuable and reliable information. They are the earliest evidence of revenues and expenditures in the Ottoman Empire – hence the role of Venice as an information hub for Christian Europe is once again unconditionally confirmed.

## Appendixes

### Appendix 1 The revenues of the sultan by Chalkokondyles, c. 1465

Source: Kaldellis 2014, Book 8, 256-71, here presented as quotations from the text; cf. Vryonis 1976, 425-6

1	Tribute (= kharaj) from Europe (= Rumelia)	~ 900,000 ducats
2	one tenth upon income from the Turks and from the others	?
3	The tax called <i>bastina</i> (patrimony)	?
4	The tax on sheep pasturage	?
5	Beyond the tribute, there are many special fees that are assigned to the sultan throughout Europe and Asia, generated by horses, camels, mules, and oxen	~ 300,000 gold pieces
6	In addition, the sultan generates substantial income from his tenants	250,000
7	The sultan's herds of horses, camels, and mules, which are from pastures throughout his realm, generate	~ 50,000
8	Other revenues	200,000
9	From trade, ferries, metals, rice, copper, alum, and one-fifth tax on slaves	~ 200,000
10	From metals	~ 100,000
11	From rice, in sultan's farms, and the sultan's other regular revenues	~ 200,000
12	Tributes	~ 100,000
	In total: ~ 4,000,000 ducats	



**Appendix 2** The revenues of the sultan by Jacopo Promontorio de Campis, 1475 (in Italian)  
Source: Babinger 1956; Zattoni 2006

Revenues from Rumelia		Revenues from Anatolia	
Focatico Europa	850,000 from fuochi 550,000	Dazio Saruchan, Ajdyn, Mentesi	32,000
Gabella (shiavi di prede)	50,000	Dazio Alanya	12,000
Dazio Costantinopoli	70,000	Focea vecchia (allume + focatico)	20,000
Dazio Gallipoli	9,000	Dazio Brussa	50,000
Saline Europa	92,000	Dazio Kastamonu	150,000
Doni, doti ecc.	200,000	Dazio Trebisonda	10,000
Zecca	123,000	Dazio e saline Caffa	10,000
Miniere Europa	120,000	Totale Karaman	35,000
Dazio Enos	11,000	Saline Asia	12,000
Dazio Salonicco	2,500		
Dazio Negroponte	12,500		
Dazio Morea	31,500		
DazioValona	1,500		
Tassa sui grani Europa	20,000		
Dazio Sofia	1,000		
Dazio Adrianopoli	12,000		
Zingari Europa	9,000		
Balnei Europa	8,000		
Gabella riso	15,000		
Dazio bestiame	10,000		
Tributo Valacchia, Venezia, Chio	Each one 10,000 30,000		
Tributo Ragusa	20,000		
<b>Totale Europa</b>	<b>1,469,000</b>	<b>Totale Asia</b>	<b>331,000</b>

Expenditures

Spese	Ducati
Stalle	100,000
Salari	550,000
Cucina	125,000
Harem	100,000
Doni, doti ecc.	200,000
Flotta	300,000
<b>Totale spese</b>	<b>1,375,000</b>

## Venetians and Ottomans in the Early Modern Age, 13-30

### Appendix 3 Venetian Anonymous, 1490 (in Italian)

Source: Venezia, Biblioteca Marciana, Marc. it. cl. VI, c. 277 (=5806), f. 169v-170r (transliteration and explanations of terms by Maria Pia Pedani)

---

<b>+ Intrade del Signor Turcho de la Grexia, 1490. In primis</b>	
Cargi di cristiani, iudei, chaxe 29 mila de casali 600. Li altri non pagano per frenchixie per diversi modi. Non messe lor summe. Pagano l'uno per l'altro mezo a l'anno	duc. 500 mila
Saline uno ano per l'altro	duc. 96 mila
La Servia con li chargi infertuti in tutto val	duc. 76 mila
Schali de Chonstantinopolli Galipolli	duc. 42 mila
Argentture sue in diversi logi	duc. 56 mila
Chanpi grexi	duc. 130 mila
Chomerchi de Sofia, Servia, Salonichi, Filipopolli, Antrinopolli et Chonstantinopolli et altri passi in diverssi logi, val	duc. 96 mila
Chomerchi in diversi logi de chastroni	duc. 16 mila
Comercio de li homeni morti senza eredi vano al Signor	duc. 20 mila
Caragi de Bosgne che dal quondam Stefano era ducati 8 mila, in summa	duc. 18 mila
Caragi de la Valachia altha	duc. 17 mila
Caragi de la Valachia bassa	duc. 6 mila
Trabesonde ducati 3 mila, Chafe ducati 3 mila, in summa	duc. 6 mila
Samastro [Amastris], Sinopi, in tutto	duc. 16 mila
Afonia [Avlonya, Valona] con chasteli do in Albania	duc. 3 mila
L'ixola de Mettelin	duc. 6 mila
Negroponte con più logi	duc. 25 mila
Sio de tributo	duc. 12 mila
Rhaguxi de tributo	duc. 14 mila

---

<b>Intrade de Turchia</b>	
Burssa, passo prexo giuso de montagne	duc. 16 mila
Comerchi presi in Altilogi [Altoluogo / Aydin] in summa	duc. 29 mila
Comerchi de chastrioni con altre intrade de insule	duc. 10 mila
Saline de Turchia	duc. 12 mila
Argentture de Turchia	duc. 10 mila
Alume uno anno per l'altro	duc. 50 mila
Rhami de Chastamoni	duc. 50 mila
summa	ducati 1 196 mila
	810 mila
resto val	ducati 386 mila

---

**Le spese del Signor Turcho per uno anno**

Soldatti pagadi de de fora del Seragio, da pagare 25 mila axpri a chalvalo	duc. 300 mila
Scudieri, zasci [çavuş (envoy)], metegi [ <i>mehter</i> (members of a musical band)]	duc. 48 mila
bostanci [ <i>bostancı</i> (member of imperial guard)], garzoni, aufalci [ ulufeci (paid soldier)], sufai [ <i>sipahi</i> (cavalry soldier)]	
Dentro del Seraio che son putti 200 con sui monechi [ <i>eunuchi</i> (eunuchs)]	duc. 17 mila
El Seraio de le done con li monechi [ <i>eunuchi</i> ]	duc. 68 mila
Schiavi adentro del Seraio spexe	duc. 20 mila
La gente del Segnor dento che sia per esser giovan	duc. 50 mila
Ale sue stale de chavali, muli, gambeli	duc. 80 mila
L'ordinario de le spexe de pavioni et toleri et cetera	duc. 10 mila
Del vestir de ganiseri de sargi tezute [ <i>stoffe tessute</i> (woven fabrics)]	duc. 28 mila
Del vestir de la chorte del Signor de pani de lana de lin	duc. 24 mila
Del vestir de la chorte de pani de seta et cetera	duc. 50 mila
Del vestir de pelo de la chorte	duc. 20 mila
Pani de seta de Burssa et de altri paexi in Persse et cetera	duc. 60 mila
Diversse chosse de cetero chel chaso tole	duc. 10 mila
Prexenti de el Signor, un ano per l'altro	duc. 25 mila

<b>summa</b>	<b>duc. 810 mila</b>
--------------	----------------------

**Appendix 4a.** Felix Petančić, 1502 (in Latin)

Source: Budapest, National Library, cod. lat. 378

Genealogia Turcor[um] imperator[um] lex imperii Domo militiaeque habita dedicata  
Ser[enissimo Principi Voladislauo Hungarie Bohemie & C[roatie]. Regi gloriosissimo.

## [f. 4] PROVENTUS EVROPE.

De.cccccc.M [80,000] domor[um] que sunt in europa x[risti]anor[um]/ a duc[atibus] duob[us] usq[ue] a duc[atibus].x. soluentiu[m] tributu[m] habe[n]t /	.i[d est] M.[ili]on VC M[il]a [1,500,000]
De domib[us].cccc. <sup>M</sup> Turcor[um]	CC M[ila] L M[ila] [250,000]
De Sale quod consumitur	CC. M[ila] [200,000]
De decimis & sicla argenti	CC. M[ila]. x x [220,000]
De pasculis grossor[um] animaliu[m] & minoru[m]	CC. M[ila] [200,000]
De piscib[us] salitis Maris et fluuior[um]	CC. M[ila] [200,000]
De omnibus fructibus terre	CCCC. M[ila] [50,000]
De censu moree epyrri moldouiae Scij & Rhag[usi].	LXX [70,000]
De hereditatib[us] mortuor[um]	LXXX. [80,000]
De omnibus scalogijs [?] i [d est] datijs	CCCC. M[ila] [500,000]
De passu gallipolitano	CL. M[ila] [150,000]

## PROVENTVS ASIE.

De uno Miol <sup>on</sup> [milion].cccc. <sup>M</sup> Domor[um] x[risti]anor[um] & Turcor[um] i[n] Asia/ existentium habet	.II. Milion. [2,000,000]
De decimis Animalium grossor[um] & minor[um]	.CCCCC. M[ila] [600,000]
De datijs mercantiar[um]	CXX. M[ila] [120,000]
De allumine Rocce	C M[ila] [100,000]
De Bombice & Risio	CCCC M[ila] [400,000]
De Cupro Castamonie	CC M[ila] [200,000]
De serico Burscie	C. M[ila] [100,000]
De censu q[uod] habet a Charamam sinope sinisso anguri finica/ Candeloro Chapha & de alijs satrapis maioribus et mi- noribus	CL M[ila] [150,000]

## EXITVS IMPER[ATORIS].

Stipendia Spahioglan[is ?] soluphtar Capici Solaki etc.  
quottidiana sunt ista vzt[videlicet] ab uno floreno ad mediu[m]  
uiritim data. J[us]ta[?] Janiciarior[um] stipendia viritim  
data sunt ista vzt[videlicet] maiora.XXV. asprar[um] uel circa  
minora vero quatuor asprar[um]. Que vniuersa acce-  
dunt ad summa[m] annum ducatorum.

**Appendix 4b.** Felix Petančić, 1502 Second version (in Latin)

Source: Venezia, Biblioteca del Museo Correr, Correr 894

---

[f. 4r/v]... Ex universa itaque summa domus in Jmperio suo existente tam Christianorum quam turcharum, et aliarum nationu[m] que viritim pendunt tributum singulis annis Jtem ex fodinis auri et argenti ferri plumbi / et aliorum metalloru[m] ac ex Sÿcla monetarum tam in Romania quam in Anatolia: Jtem ex [ceteris] fodinis in Chestemoni, et ex fodinis aluminis in Anatolia: Jtem ex bombice oriza. et ex vectigalibus Serici in bursia. Item ex piscibus salitis tam Maritimis quam fluvialibus: Jtem ex redditibus salium [salinam?] tam in Romania quam in Anatolia. Jtem ex decimis et pascuis cunctorum aigalium: Jtem ex omnibus fructibus et ceteris terre nascentijs: Jtem ex portiorijs in Anatolia, et ex scalogijs in Romania.i.[in] doanis siue uectigalibus: Jtem ex tractu Gallipolitano, et aliorum locorum Jtem ex hereditatibus mortuorum qn[?] ex deffectu propinquorum deuolunt[ur?] bona ad Jmpereatoris: Jtem ex tributo variarum urbium que sunt in Romania.i.[in] Morea, Epyro, Moldouia, scio Calogero[?], et Rhagusio: similiter ex urbibus et provincijs que sunt in Anatolia.i.[in] a Charaman, Sÿnope, Symisso. anguri finica, Caneloro, Capha, et alijs satrapis maioribus vel minoribus habet circiter quadrigessies centena milia numerorum aurorum [4,000,000]...

---

## Venetians and Ottomans in the Early Modern Age, 13-30

---

### Appendix 5. Tommaso Contarini, 1522 (in Italian)

Source: Contarini 1996, 39 [194v]: *Intrade del Signor Turcho*

---

Carazo ducati	1,500,000
Bestiame	1,000,000
Menere	900,000
Comerchi	700,000
Sali	500,000
Cassi	-
Legno	100,000
Beitumazi	100,000
Passi	500,000
Peschiere	500,000
Cecha	300,000
censi Bogdan ducati	60,000
Ulacco	12,000
Ragusi	12,000
Syo	10,000
Cypro	8,000
Zante	500

Which results in total (not summed by the author): 6,202,500 ducats

---

## Bibliography

- Babinger, Franz (1956). "Die Aufzeichnungen des Genuesen Iacopo de Promontorio - de Campis über den Osmanenstaat". *Sitzungsberichte / Bayerische Akademie der Wiss. Phil.-hist. Klasse*, Heft 8, 29-95. URL <http://publikationen.badw.de/008523748.pdf> (2018-02-22)
- Babinger, Franz (1961). s.v. "Angiolello, Giovanni Maria". *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 3. Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia italiana, 275-278. URL [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/giovanni-maria-angiolello\\_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/giovanni-maria-angiolello_(Dizionario-Biografico)/) (2018-02-22)
- Babinger, Franz (1978). *Mehmed the Conqueror and his Time*. Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press.
- Barkan, Omer Lütfi [1970] (1978). "Research of the Ottoman Fiscal Surveys". Michael Allan Cook (ed.), *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East from the Rise of Islam to the Present Day*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 163-71.
- Beldiceanu, Nicoara (1960). *Les Actes des premiers sultans conservés dans les manuscrits turcs de la bibliothèque Nationale à Paris I. Actes de Mehmet II et de la Bayezid II du MS. Fonds turc ancien 39*. Paris: Mouton.
- Bertrandon de la Broquière (1848). "The travels of Bertrandon de la Broquière". Wright, T. (ed.), *Early travels in Palestine*. London: Henry G. Bohn, 283-382.
- Boykov, Grigor (2016). "The Human Cost of Warfare: Population Loss during the Ottoman Conquest and the Demographic History of Bulgaria in the Late Middle Ages and Early Modern Era". Schmitt, Oliver Jens (ed.), *The Ottoman Conquest of the Balkans: Interpretations and Research Debates*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 103-66. *Sitzungsberichte / Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse* 872.
- Contarini, Tommaso (1996). "Sommario della relazione". Pedani-Fabris 1996, 35-9.
- Danova, Penka (2010). "Giovan-Marija Angiolello i negovoto opisanie na Konstantinopol (sl. 1147 g.)" Джован-Мария Анджолело и неговото описание на Константинопол (сл. 1477 г.) (Giovanni Maria Angiolello and his description of Costantinople [after the year 1447]). *Istorichesko budeshte* Историческо бъдеще (Historical future), 1-2, 211-36.
- Darling, Linda T. (1996). *Revenue-Raising and Legitimacy: Tax Collection and Finance Administration in the Ottoman Empire, 1560-1660*. The Ottoman Empire and Its Heritage. Politics, Society and Economy 6. Leiden: Brill.
- Darling, Linda T. (1997). "Ottoman Fiscal Administration: Decline or Adaptation?" *Journal of European Economic History*, 26(1), 157-79.
- Darling, Linda T. (2008). "The Development of Ottoman Governmental Institutions in the Fourteenth Century: A Reconstruction". Costantini,

- Vera; Koller, Markus (eds.), *Living in the Ottoman Ecumenical Community: Essays in Honour of Suraiya Faroqhi*. Leiden: Brill, 17-34.
- Dimitrov, Stefan (2015). "Transformation of the Byzantine Adrianople into the Ottoman Edirne". *Études balkaniques*, 51(4), 111-50.
- İnalçık, Halil (1973). *The Ottoman Empire. The Classical Age. 1300-1600*. London: Phoenix.
- İnalçık, Halil (1994). "The Ottoman State: Economy and Society, 1300-1600". İnalçık, Halil; Quataert, Donald (eds.), *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 9-409.
- İnalçık, Halil (2007). "The Ottoman Survey of 1455". *The Conquest and Istanbul in 550th Anniversary*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1-10.
- İnalçık, Halil. (2012). *The Survey of Istanbul 1455: The Text, English Translation, Analysis of the Text, Documents*. Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Iorga, Nicolae [1935] (1982). *Byzance après Byzance. Continuation de l'histoire de la vie byzantine*. Bucarest; Paris: Institut d'études byzantines; Édition Balland.
- Iorga, Nicolae [1909] (2015). *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches, Zweiter Band Bis 1538*. Paderborn: Europaisches Geschichtsverlag.
- Kaldellis, Anthony (2012). "The Greek Sources of Laonikos Chalkokondyles, Histories". *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*, 52, 738-65. URL <http://grbs.library.duke.edu/article/download/14641/3791> (2018-08-31).
- Kaldellis, Anthony (2014). *The Histories. Laonikos Chalkokondyles*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Mocenigo, Tommaso (1996). "Tommaso Mocenigo, ambasciator. Sommario della relazione". Pedani-Fabris 1996, 435-45.
- Pedani Fabris, Maria Pia (1996). *Relazioni inedite. Costantinopoli (1508-1789)*. Vol. 14 di *Relazioni di ambasciatori veneti al Senato*. Padova: Aldo Ausilio editore - Bottega d'Erasmus.
- Pertusi, Agostino (1970). "I primi studi in Occidente sull'origine e la potenza dei turchi". *Studi veneziani*, 12, 465-552.
- Preiser-Kapeller, Johannes (2013). "Laonicus Chalcocondyles". Thomas, David; Mallett, Alexander (eds.), *1350-1500*. Vol. 5 of *Christian-Muslim Relations. A Bibliographical History*. Leiden: Brill, 481-9.
- Rakova, Snezhana (2014). "Felix Petančić, Buda i Venezija: interesat kam Osmanskata imperija v nacaloto na XVI vek" Феликс Петанчич, Буда и Венеция: интересът към Османската империя в началото на XVI век (Felix Petancic, Buda and Venice: the interest in the Ottoman Empire at the beginning of the 16th century). "Balkanite i svetat" Балканите и светът (The Balkans and the World: modus concurrandi). Monogr. no., *Studia balcanica*, 30, 241-50.



- Rakova, Snezhana (2015-16). "Between the Sultan and the Doge: Diplomats and Spies in the Time of Suleyman the Magnificent". *CAS Working Paper Series (Centre for Advanced Study Sofia)*, 8, 3-35.
- Sanuto, Marino (1879). *I diarii*, vol. 1. Venezia: A spese degli editori.
- Vryonis, Speros (1976). "Laonikos Chalkokondyles and the Ottoman Budget". *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 7, 423-32.
- Zattoni, Piero (2006). "Le forze militari ottomane secondo Jacopo da Promontorio". *Bizantinistica. Rivista di studi slavi e bizantini*, 2a serie, 8, 305-30.

